

invention). The Applicant respectfully requests clarification of this rejection and the specific language that the Examiner is using to apply this rejection.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Polk does not qualify as appropriate prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as Polk does not disclose (expressly or inherently) all of the features of independent Claims 8, 17 and 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 8, 17 and 23 are patentable over the cited reference for at least these reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejection as applied to independent Claims 8, 17, since the application is in condition for allowance.

D. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited. Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully asked that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. Alternatively should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, they are invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael S. Neustel/
Michael S. Neustel (Reg. No. 41,221)
NEUSTEL LAW OFFICES, Ltd.
2534 South University Drive, Suite No. 4
Fargo, North Dakota 58103

May 21, 2008
Date

Telephone: (701) 281-8822
Facsimile: (701) 237-0544
e-mail: Michael@neustel.com

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically with the USPTO via ECF on May 21, 2008.

/Jericka M. Miller/
Jericka M. Miller

NEUSTEL LAW OFFICES, LTD
2534 South University Drive, Suite No. 4
Fargo, North Dakota 58103
Telephone: (701) 281-8822
Facsimile: (701) 237-0544